

2020 PARK CONDITION ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

FACILITY:

NAME:

For each category listed below, please MARK the appropriate response based on the entire park.

Enter 2020 scores online: <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScwABqJedEb-Ur23Hl4M--RpbRDG2aJBGr2e8ianCuZR6caCQ/viewform?vc=0&c=0&w=1>

	Rating # 1: Unacceptable	Rating # 2: Needs improvement	Rating # 3: Acceptable Condition	Rating # 4: Good	Rating # 5: Excellent	N/A
GROUNDS						
1	Overall Aesthetics (litter, graffiti, vandalism, cleanliness, odor):	Overflowing garbage, litter and debris present throughout park, extensive graffiti and vandalism is observed, odor from garbage is present, and/or illegal dump present, tables and benches require deep cleaning or painting.	Concentrated areas of garbage are visible, some graffiti and vandalism is observed, odor from garbage is present, tables and benches require deep cleaning or painting. There may be an insufficient number of garbage cans present or many are in need of replacement.	Park is free of all but unconcentrated, tiny remnants of litter, no noticeable odor, tables and benches are suitable for public use, very little graffiti or vandalism observed. There may be an insufficient number of garbage cans present or some are in need of replacement.	Park is free of all but unconcentrated, tiny remnants of litter, no noticeable odor, tables and benches are in good condition and painted (free of staining), no graffiti or vandalism observed. Sufficient number of garbage cans are present.	Park is free of all visible litter and garbage, tables and benches are like new, no graffiti or vandalism. Sufficient number of garbage cans are present.
	Comments					
2	Turf Appearance:	75% or more weeds, bare spots or brown patches. May include extensive gopher or squirrel activity. Gopher and/or squirrel program abatement necessary.	50% or more weeds, bare spots, brown patches. May include extensive gopher or squirrel activity.	25% - 50% weeds, bare spots, brown patches. Good condition overall. Playable. May include some gopher or squirrel activity.	10% - 25% weeds, bare spots, brown patches. Very good condition. Turf is healthy. May include slight gopher or squirrel activity.	10% or fewer weeds, bare spots, brown patches. No gopher or squirrel activity.
	Comments					
TREES						
3	Trees:	More than 20% of trees appear to be dead. Could be a potential fire hazard or near areas where people could be present. Tree(s) have been impacted by amenities (i.e., walkways too close, tree well too small).	10-20% of trees look unhealthy with some dead branches, may have insect infestation, or major corrective pruning needed. Tree(s) have been impacted by amenities (i.e., walkways too close, tree well too small).	5% of trees look unhealthy; needs pruning, no insects. May need corrective pruning to meet clearance requirements or require thinning. Tree(s) have the potential to be impacted by amenities (i.e., walkways too close, tree well too small, etc.).	Trees appear healthy; good green color, no disease. May require structural or minor pruning to meet 8-foot clearance requirement. Tree and/or root system not impacted by nearby amenities.	Healthy looking, no dead branches, no apparent insect infestation, no obvious disease. Meets all clearance requirements (i.e., no branches within 8 feet of ground). Tree and/or root system not impacted by nearby amenities.

2020 PARK CONDITION ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

		Rating # 1: Unacceptable	Rating # 2: Needs improvement	Rating # 3: Acceptable Condition	Rating # 4: Good	Rating # 5: Excellent	N/A
	Comments						
4	Tree Basins (area within 3-ft. of tree trunk):	Groundcover growing up into the tree. Weeds taken over 75% or more of the tree basin. Unhealthy for tree.	Tree basin has 50% OR MORE weeds. Needs improvement.	Basin has 25-50% weeds.	Weeds are 10-25% per basin/average.	Less than 10% weeds in tree basins.	
	Comments						
SHRUBS AND GROUNDCOVER							
5	Shrubs:	Plant appears to be diseased or 75% or more dead growth.	50% decline in growth/ new growth.	Good overall appearance; may begin to show signs of premature leaf drop or thinning.	Appears healthy; good green color, no disease. May require minor pruning.	Newly planted.	
	Comments						
6	Landscaped Beds (any area not turf and should have plantings or groundcover):	Area is more than 50% weeds or bare dirt.	Area is 10 - 49% weeds or bare dirt.	Area is 5 - 10% weeds or bare dirt.	Area is less than 5% weeds or bare dirt.	All landscaped areas are healthy in appearance or mulched, no obvious disease, no gaps in coverage, no litter or debris, and minimal weed encroachment.	
	Comments						
SPORTS FIELDS							
7	Sports Fields (infields, outfields, and amenities for reservable sports fields):	Extensive gopher or squirrel activity causing open holes in the infield. Infield is not level with surrounding turf; batters box is not level. Backstops, fencing, and dugouts unsafe/ need replacement.	Potential tripping hazards from woody weeds (mallow), worn areas, or from gopher/squirrel/ mole activity. Backstops, fencing and dugouts in need of repair. Infield requires repair / leveling.	Some gopher activity is evident. A partial field renovation may be necessary. Backstop, fencing, and dugouts are in satisfactory condition and may need painting or minor repairs. Infield is on good condition.	Free of bumpiness, weed clumps, mounds, slopes on the grade, wet and dry spots, bare areas, and holes or other obstructions. Infield is in good condition and does not require any repair. Backstops, fencing and dugouts are in good condition and free of substantial defects.	Manicured, infield borders trimmed, big and little holes filled; lines are straight, mowing patterns are attractive. Turf, backstops, and dugouts are like new. No gopher or squirrel activity. Sprinklers are flush with the surface.	
	Comments						

2020 PARK CONDITION ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

		Rating # 1: Unacceptable	Rating # 2: Needs improvement	Rating # 3: Acceptable Condition	Rating # 4: Good	Rating # 5: Excellent	N/A
8	Artificial Turf:	Seams are broken, and there is mounding or hollowing of infill beneath the turf panel. Fiber blades are worn, exposing the infill. Needs replacement.	Seams are loose, but turf panel has not shifted and infill is not mounding. Fiber blades are worn, but not exposing infill. Needs replacement soon.	Fibers beginning to wear, may be bent and/or discolored. Some debris on field. Seams are holding and turf panels are in place.	Fibers mostly straight, slight discoloration, some debris on field. Seams are holding and turf panels are in place. Early minor signs of wear.	New or like new.	
	Comments						
9	Bleachers (Sports Field):	Structural damage or deterioration of seat boards, steps, or railings. Needs replacement.	Extensive wear. Needs replacement soon.	Infrastructure showing signs of wear. Likely 5-10 years old.	Minor trouble spots. Early signs of wear. Appx. 3-5 years old.	New or like new.	
	Surface (circle one): Wood or Metal						
Comments							
PLAYGROUNDS							
10	#1- Tot (2-5 yrs.)	Exposed footings or fabric, entrapments, or missing parts.	Equipment might be in need of repair. Fibar or sand below the acceptable safety line. Resilient surface needs repair.	Older equipment, but safe and working. Looks in fairly good condition.	Equipment in safe working condition, equipment looks good.	New or like new.	
	Surface (circle one): Rubber, sand, or fibar						
Comments							
11	#2- Youth (5-11 yrs.)	Exposed footings or fabric, entrapments, or missing parts.	Equipment might be in need of repair. Fibar or sand below the acceptable safety line. Resilient surface needs repair.	Older equipment, but safe and working. Looks in fairly good condition.	Equipment in safe working condition, equipment looks good.	New or like new.	
	Surface (circle one): Rubber, sand, or fibar						
Comments							

2020 PARK CONDITION ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

		Rating # 1: Unacceptable	Rating # 2: Needs improvement	Rating # 3: Acceptable Condition	Rating # 4: Good	Rating # 5: Excellent	N/A
HARDSCAPES							
12	Sidewalks (public right-of-way along park frontage):	Buckling/ tree roots- in need of immediate repair; uneven surface(s).	Rough surface, some holes and dips in asphalt, concrete broken in places, minor raised areas.	Fairly smooth surface, minor cracks in asphalt or concrete, a few very small holes, a few minor dips in asphalt.	Smooth surface, minor cracks, no holes or dips, some staining may be present from plant material.	New or like new.	
	Comments						
13	Pathways (interior to the park):	Asphalt, concrete, or DG missing; potential hazard.	Raised uneven surface/ potential tripping hazard.	Fairly smooth surface, minor cracks in asphalt or concrete, a few very small holes, a few minor dips in asphalt.	Smooth surface, minor cracks, no holes or dips, some staining may be present from plant material.	New or like new.	
	Comments						
14	Parking lots:	Excessive potholes and/or needs striping.	Rough surface, pot holes and dips are present, slurry seal will probably repair.	Fairly smooth surface, minor cracks, a few very small pot holes, a few dips. May need restriping.	Smooth surface, minor cracks, no pot holes or dips. Good striping.	New or like new.	
	Comments						
15	Tennis Courts:	Surface area poor (large cracks, dips, and holes), boundary lines gone, poles down, nets missing or ruined, surrounding fence missing.	Surface area poor (small cracks and holes) needs resurfacing, boundary lines faded, poles loose, nets in poor condition, surrounding fence is in need of repair.	Surface area fair (minor cracks and holes), boundary lines may need restriping, poles firmly in place, net in fair condition, condition of fence does not impact play.	Surface area good (very few cracks, no holes), boundary lines legible, poles firmly in place, net in good condition, fence in good condition.	Surface area smooth (no cracks holes), boundary lines freshly painted, equipment in new condition, fence in new condition.	
	Comments						
16	Basketball Courts:	Surface area poor (large cracks, dips, and holes), boundary lines gone, poles down, nets and other amenities (e.g., backboards) missing or ruined.	Surface area poor (small cracks and holes) needs resurfacing, boundary lines faded, poles loose, nets and other amenities (e.g., backboards) in poor condition.	Surface area fair (minor cracks and holes), boundary lines may need restriping, poles firmly in place, net and other amenities (e.g., backboards) in fair condition.	Surface area good (very few cracks, no holes), boundary lines legible, poles firmly in place, net and other amenities (e.g., backboards) in good condition.	Surface area smooth (no cracks holes), boundary lines freshly painted, amenities in new or like condition.	
	Comments						

2020 PARK CONDITION ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

		Rating # 1: Unacceptable	Rating # 2: Needs improvement	Rating # 3: Acceptable Condition	Rating # 4: Good	Rating # 5: Excellent	N/A
17	Court Surfaces (e.g., bocce, futsal, etc.):	Uneven surface and/or cracks.	Needs improvement	Infrastructure may require future attention; monitor.	Normal wear. Good condition.	New or like new.	
	Comments						
RESERVABLE PICNIC AREA							
18	Tables:	Unusable and/or vandalized beyond repair.	Extensive wear. Exposed rebar or damaged. Renovation or steam cleaning may be necessary.	Fair condition. May have minor damage, but is usable.	Almost new, may be worn from the elements.	New or like new.	
	Comments						
19	BBQ Pits:	Unusable (e.g., BBQ pit rusted through) and/or vandalized beyond repair.	Extensive wear. Exposed rebar and/or damaged.	Heavy use, but not broken. May have minor rust.	In good condition, no rust, little writing.	New or like new.	
	Comments						
NON-RESERVABLE PICNIC AREA							
20	Tables:	Unusable and/or vandalized beyond repair.	Extensive wear. Exposed rebar and/or damaged. Renovation or steam cleaning may be necessary.	Fair condition. May have minor damage, but is usable.	Almost new, may be worn from the elements.	New or like new.	
	Comments						
21	BBQ Pits	Unusable (e.g., BBQ pit rusted through) and/or vandalized beyond repair.	Extensive wear/ exposed rebar/ damaged.	Heavy use, but not broken. May have minor rust.	In good condition, no rust, little writing.	New or like new.	
	Comments						

2020 PARK CONDITION ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

		Rating # 1: Unacceptable	Rating # 2: Needs improvement	Rating # 3: Acceptable Condition	Rating # 4: Good	Rating # 5: Excellent	N/A
AMENITIES							
22	Game tables (generally smaller than picnic tables and of square shape):	Structurally unusable.	Needs repairs or gaming surface has been lost or painted over.	Worn, but usable.	Good condition.	New or like new.	
	Comments						
23	Drinking Fountains:	Broken and/or unusable.	Clogged, stuck button, or major leaking that requires immediate attention.	Clean, might require minor adjustment, may have minor leak, but fair drainage and fair water flow.	Fountain is in good working condition, good water flow, good drainage, surrounding area dry.	New or like new.	
	Comments						
24	Benches:	Broken and/or unusable.	Needs repair.	Minor vandalism, but usable.	Regular wear and tear.	New or like new.	
	Comments						
PAR-COURSE							
25	Par -course stations	Beyond repair. Needs to be replaced.	Usable, but damaged. Equipment might be in need of repair.	Shows normal wear and tear. May need repairs.	Looks good, but not quite new.	New.	
	Comments						

2020 PARK CONDITION ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

		Rating # 1: Unacceptable	Rating # 2: Needs improvement	Rating # 3: Acceptable Condition	Rating # 4: Good	Rating # 5: Excellent	N/A
STRUCTURES							
26	Restroom Buildings	Large cracks in floors and walls, broken windows, doors broken, toilets and sinks broken, metal surfaces rusted through, renovation / replacement necessary. Narrow doors / no handicap access.	May have leaky faucets and toilets, broken windows, rust, no handicap access - disrepair, renovation possible.	Toilets and sinks work and are in satisfactory condition (may have rust stains), stalls are secure with minor rusting, minor cracks in floors and walls, window cracked, needs handicap access.	Toilets and sinks are in good condition. Floors and walls have minor (cosmetic) cracks, stalls are secure and have no rust, no cracked or broken windows. Handicap accessible.	All restroom equipment is in new condition. Handicap accessible.	
	Comments						
27	Shade Structure (e.g., pergola, shade sails or other structure):	Unusable and/or vandalized beyond repair.	Extensive wear. Vandalized, rips in materials and/or significant rust affects the shade function.	Fair condition. May have some damage (rust, rot, rips), but is structurally sound and damage does not affect shade function. May need repainting.	Structurally sound, minimal rotten lumber, rusted metal, or ripped material.	New or like new.	
	Comments						

ATTACHMENT B

2020 Park Condition Assessment Scores by Park

Park District	Council District	Park Name	2020 PCA	2019 PCA
3	1	Calabazas Branch Library	3.9	3.6
3	1	Calabazas Park	3.1	3.4
3	1	Cypress Community Center	3.5	3.1
3	1	Gleason Park	4.0	3.7
3	1	Gullo Park	4.0	3.8
3	1	Hathaway Park	3.9	3.2
3	1	John Mise Park	4.0	3.5
3	1	Marijane Hamann Park	3.2	2.7
3	1	Murdock Park	3.1	3.1
3	1	Rainbow Park	2.8	2.7
3	1	San Tomas Park	3.5	3.6
3	1	Saratoga Creek Park	3.8	3.4
3	1	Starbird Park	3.2	3.3
3	1	West Evergreen Park	3.6	3.6
3	1	West San Jose Community & Policing Center	3.9	3.2
1	2	Avenida Espana Park	3.9	3.4
2	2	Basking Ridge Park	3.8	3.3
1	2	Calero Park	3.8	3.5
1	2	Century Oaks Park	4.0	3.0
1	2	Charlotte Commons	4.0	3.8
2	2	Chynoweth Park	3.5	3.4
2	2	Coy Park	3.5	3.3
2	2	Danna Rock Park	3.4	3.2
2	2	Edenvale Branch Library	3.9	4.1
2	2	Edenvale Community Center	4.1	4.1
2	2	Edenvale Garden Park	3.3	3.4
1	2	George Page Park	3.3	3.4
2	2	Great Oaks Park	3.3	2.8
1	2	La Colina Park	3.4	3.0
1	2	Los Paseos Park	3.6	3.5
2	2	Melody Park	3.9	3.1
2	2	Metcalf Park	3.1	3.3
1	2	Miner Park	3.8	3.3
1	2	Miyuki Dog Park	3.2	3.6
1	2	Palmia Park	3.2	3.3
2	2	Piercy Park	3.5	3.4
1	2	Raleigh Park	3.5	3.8
1	2	Ramac Park	4.0	3.6
1	2	Santa Teresa Branch Library	4.0	4.3
2	2	Shady Oaks Park	3.1	3.4

ATTACHMENT B

2020 Park Condition Assessment Scores by Park

Park District	Council District	Park Name	2020 PCA	2019 PCA
2	2	Silver Leaf Park	3.7	3.7
1	2	Southside Community Center	3.8	*
1	2	Southside Police Substation	3.7	4.5
5	3	Backesto Park	2.8	3.1
2	3	Bestor Art Park	3.7	3.9
5	3	Biblioteca Latinoamericana Branch Library	4.0	3.4
3	3	Biebrach Park	3.0	2.9
2	3	Bonita Park	3.7	4.3
5	3	Brenda Lopez Memorial Plaza	4.2	2.6
5	3	Cannery Park	4.8	**
5	3	City Hall Plaza	3.7	3.7
5	3	Columbus Park	2.1	2.2
5	3	Discovery Dog Park	2.3	2.9
5	3	East San Jose Carnegie Branch Library	4.1	3.3
8	3	Environmental Innovation Center	4.4	4.3
5	3	Fallon House	4.3	3.8
2	3	Forestdale Tot Lot	4.2	4.7
3	3	Gardner Community Center	3.4	3.7
5	3	Guadalupe Gardens and Heritage Rose Garden	2.9	2.7
5	3	Guadalupe River Park	3.1	3.4
5	3	Guadalupe River Park - Arena Green (East)	2.9	3.3
5	3	Guadalupe River Park - Arena Green (West)	3.0	3.3
5	3	Guadalupe River Park - Courtyard Garden	1.9	2.7
5	3	Guadalupe River Park - Discovery Meadow	2.2	2.8
5	3	Guadalupe River Park - Historic Orchard	3.0	2.7
8	3	Hacienda Creek Park	3.9	3.5
5	3	John P. McEnery Park	3.4	3.2
5	3	Joyce Ellington Branch Library	3.4	3.8
5	3	Luna Park	3.5	3.7
2	3	Martin Park	2.7	2.6
5	3	Newhall Park	4.4	3.6
5	3	Northside Community Center	3.4	3.3
5	3	O'Donnell's Gardens Park	4.5	3.5
8	3	Orchard Park	4.3	3.8
5	3	Parque de los Pobladores	4.4	3.3
5	3	Parque de Padre Mateo Sheedy	3.1	3.5
5	3	Pellier Park	5.0	4.3
5	3	Peralta Adobe	5.0	4.0
5	3	Plaza de Cesar Chavez	2.7	3.5
5	3	Raymond Bernal Jr. Memorial Park	2.9	2.9

ATTACHMENT B

2020 Park Condition Assessment Scores by Park

Park District	Council District	Park Name	2020 PCA	2019 PCA
5	3	Roosevelt Park	2.8	2.6
5	3	Rosemary Gardens Park	3.6	3.3
5	3	Ryland Dog Park	3.6	3.4
5	3	Ryland Park	3.4	2.9
2	3	Selma Olinder Park	2.5	3.1
5	3	St. James Park	3.5	3.3
3	3	Tamien Park	4.6	4.1
5	3	Washington United Youth Center	3.6	*
5	3	Watson Park	4.1	3.9
2	3	William Street Park	3.4	2.9
8	4	Alviso Community Policing Center	3.9	3.1
8	4	Alviso Library & Community Center	3.4	2.9
8	4	Alviso Park	3.0	2.9
8	4	Alviso Youth Center	3.4	3.1
8	4	Berryessa Branch Library	3.4	3.5
8	4	Berryessa Community Center	3.4	3.2
8	4	Berryessa Creek Park	3.8	3.8
8	4	Brooktree Park	3.7	3.4
8	4	Cataldi Park	3.5	3.4
8	4	Commodore Park	4.1	*
8	4	Flickinger Park	3.3	3.1
8	4	Gran Paradiso Park	3.8	3.4
8	4	Iris Chang Park	4.1	**
8	4	Moitozo Park	4.9	4.6
8	4	Noble House	3.8	3.7
8	4	Noble Park	3.5	3.7
8	4	Northwood Park	3.4	3.1
8	4	Old Alviso Community Center	3.5	3.3
8	4	Penitencia Creek Park	3.5	3.2
8	4	River Oaks Park	3.9	3.7
8	4	Riverview Park	4.8	4.2
8	4	Townsend Park	3.1	3.3
8	4	Vinci Park	3.7	3.1
8	4	Vista Montana (5 acre)	3.5	3.6
8	4	Vista Montana (1 acre)	4.6	*
8	5	Alum Rock Park	3.4	2.7
8	5	Alum Rock Youth Center	3.5	3.0
4	5	Boys and Girls Club (Smythe Field)	1.3	1.7
8	5	Capitol Park	3.7	3.4
8	5	Children of the Rainbow Park	3.7	3.3

ATTACHMENT B

2020 Park Condition Assessment Scores by Park

Park District	Council District	Park Name	2020 PCA	2019 PCA
8	5	Cimarron Park	3.6	3.1
8	5	Dr. Roberto Cruz - Alum Rock Branch Library	3.4	3.7
8	5	Educational Park Branch Library	2.7	2.4
6	5	Emma Prusch Farm Park	3.8	4.0
8	5	Esther Medina Park	3.8	4.3
8	5	Fleming Park	4.1	3.8
8	5	Hank Lopez Community Center	2.8	3.1
8	5	Hillview Park	3.1	3.3
8	5	LoBue Park	3.2	3.3
8	5	Madden Park	4.0	3.2
8	5	Mayfair Park	3.4	3.0
4	5	Mt. Pleasant Park	3.5	3.2
8	5	Nancy Lane Plaza	2.7	3.0
4	5	New Hillview Library	3.4	3.5
8	5	Our Park	3.3	3.4
8	5	Overfelt Gardens	2.8	2.1
7	5	P.A.L. Stadium Park	3.9	3.5
8	5	Parque de la Amistad	3.3	3.1
8	5	Plata Arroyo Park	3.3	3.0
8	5	San Antonio Tot Lot	3.9	3.4
8	5	Sheppard Sports Field	3.6	4.0
8	5	Sylvia Cassell Park	3.2	*
8	5	Zolezzi Park	3.4	3.7
3	6	Bascom Community Center and Library	3.8	3.2
3	6	Buena Vista Park	4.0	3.8
5	6	Cahill Park	2.8	3.3
2	6	Canoas Park	2.8	2.8
3	6	Del Monte Park	4.0	3.5
3	6	Fire Training Center	3.6	2.6
3	6	Frank M. Santana Park	3.5	3.4
3	6	Fuller Avenue Park	3.3	3.8
3	6	Gregory Tot Lot	3.9	3.5
5	6	Hester Park	3.0	2.5
3	6	Hummingbird Park	4.6	4.1
3	6	Lincoln Glen Park	3.8	*
3	6	Municipal Rose Garden	3.4	3.5
5	6	O'Connor Park	3.5	3.7
3	6	River Glen Park	2.7	3.2
5	6	Rose Garden Branch Library	3.9	3.0
3	6	Roy Avenue Park	3.5	3.5

ATTACHMENT B

2020 Park Condition Assessment Scores by Park

Park District	Council District	Park Name	2020 PCA	2019 PCA
2	6	Rubino Park	2.5	2.8
3	6	St. Elizabeth Park	4.4	3.6
5	6	Theodore Lenzen Park	4.4	3.9
3	6	Wallenberg Park	3.2	3.3
3	6	Wilcox Park	4.2	3.8
3	6	Willow Glen Branch Library	4.8	4.0
3	6	Willow Glen Community and Senior Center	3.4	3.4
3	6	Willow Street Frank Bramhall Park	3.2	3.2
5	7	Alma Community Center	3.5	3.2
5	7	Bellevue Park	3.8	2.7
2	7	Communications Hill - Stairway	4.0	3.4
2	7	Dove Hill Park	3.7	3.4
2	7	Fair Swim Center and Tot Lot	3.4	3.1
2	7	Kelley Park	3.3	3.4
6	7	Kelley Park - Happy Hollow Park and Zoo	3.9	3.8
2	7	Kelley Park - Japanese Friendship Garden	3.4	3.6
2	7	Kelley Park - San Jose History Park	3.8	3.3
2	7	Kelley Park - Vietnamese Heritage Garden	2.0	2.7
2	7	La Ragione Tot Lot	3.2	3.9
2	7	Lone Bluff Park	3.4	2.4
2	7	McLaughlin Park	3.7	3.7
2	7	Municipal Rifle Range	2.8	2.6
2	7	Nisich Park	4.1	4.6
2	7	Ramblewood Park	3.5	3.3
2	7	Richardson Park	4.0	4.2
3	7	Roberto Antonio Balermينو Park	4.1	3.6
2	7	Rocksprings Park	3.8	3.3
2	7	San Jose Animal Care Center	3.7	3.6
2	7	Seven Trees Community Center	3.0	2.7
2	7	Shirakawa Community Center	3.0	2.8
2	7	Solari Park	3.3	3.4
4	7	Stonegate Park	3.1	3.1
4	7	Tully Community Ballfields	3.2	3.5
4	7	Tully Community Branch Library	3.5	3.5
2	7	Turtle Rock Park	3.3	3.4
2	7	Vieira Park	3.3	3.5
2	7	Vieira Park Overlook	3.9	3.8
3	7	West Valley Branch Library	4.5	4.0
2	7	William Manly Park	4.0	4.6
4	7	Windmill Springs Park	3.8	3.3

ATTACHMENT B

2020 Park Condition Assessment Scores by Park

Park District	Council District	Park Name	2020 PCA	2019 PCA
4	8	Aborn Park	3.2	4.2
7	8	Arcadia Ballpark	4.8	**
4	8	Boggini Park	2.9	3.5
4	8	Brigadoon Park	3.5	2.8
4	8	Brigadoon Tot Lot	3.5	3.4
4	8	Canyon Creek Park	3.7	3.3
4	8	Evergreen Branch Library	3.5	3.2
4	8	Evergreen Community Center	3.9	3.2
4	8	Evergreen Park	3.7	3.6
4	8	Falls Creek Park	4.0	3.7
4	8	Fernish Park	4.0	3.7
4	8	Fowler Creek Park	3.6	3.5
4	8	Groesbeck Hill Park	2.9	3.2
4	8	Lake Cunningham Park	2.8	3.3
4	8	Meadowfair Community Center	3.9	3.3
4	8	Meadowfair Park	3.4	3.2
4	8	Metzer Ranch	3.8	3.4
4	8	Montgomery Hill Park	4.0	3.6
4	8	Norwood Creek Park	3.0	*
4	8	Silver Creek Linear Park	3.9	3.9
4	8	Silver Creek Linear Park - Picnic Meadow	3.7	3.8
4	8	Village Square Branch Library	3.8	3.9
4	8	Welch Park	3.3	3.8
1	9	Branham Park	2.9	3.4
1	9	Butcher Park	2.2	2.6
1	9	Cambrian Branch Library	3.3	4.1
1	9	Camden Community Center and Park	3.1	3.4
3	9	Carolyn Norris Park	3.3	3.6
1	9	De Anza Park	3.1	3.5
3	9	Doerr Park	2.8	2.7
1	9	Erikson Park	3.5	3.7
1	9	Houge Park	2.7	3.0
1	9	Kirk Park	2.8	3.7
1	9	Lone Hill Park	2.9	2.7
3	9	Paul Moore Park	3.0	3.0
1	9	Pearl Ave Branch Library	3.6	3.4
1	9	Richard E Huerta Park	2.7	3.0
3	9	Russo Park	3.6	3.9
1	9	Scottsdale Park	3.7	4.2
2	9	Terrell Park	2.9	3.4

ATTACHMENT B

2020 Park Condition Assessment Scores by Park

Park District	Council District	Park Name	2020 PCA	2019 PCA
2	9	Thousand Oaks Park	3.4	3.1
1	9	William Cilker Park	3.2	4.0
1	10	Almaden Community Center and Library	3.0	3.4
1	10	Almaden Lake Park	3.3	3.0
1	10	Almaden Meadows Park	3.1	2.8
1	10	Almaden Winery Park	3.4	3.4
1	10	Cahalan Park	3.7	3.5
1	10	Carrabelle Park	3.6	3.4
1	10	Cathedral Oaks Park	4.0	3.7
1	10	Chris Hotts Park	3.0	3.3
1	10	Comanche Park	3.5	3.8
1	10	Foothill Park	3.6	3.0
1	10	Glenview Park	3.6	3.2
1	10	Greystone Park	3.7	3.6
1	10	Guadalupe Oak Grove Park	3.3	4.1
1	10	Jeffery Fontana Park	2.9	3.1
2	10	Meadows Park	2.8	2.8
1	10	O'Malley Steinbeck Sports Field	4.5	3.8
2	10	Parkview I Park	3.1	2.6
2	10	Parkview II Park	3.5	2.6
2	10	Parkview III Park	3.5	2.7
1	10	Parma Park	3.4	2.9
1	10	Pfeiffer Park	3.7	3.5
1	10	Playa del Rey Park	3.4	3.5
1	10	T.J. Martin Park	3.0	2.6
1	10	Vineland Branch Library	3.4	3.8
2	10	Vista Park	3.7	3.4
2	10	Waterford Park	3.6	3.7

* PCA score not available for 2019.

** Park opened in 2019-2020 and rated for the first time in 2020.

ATTACHMENT C

2020 Park Condition Assessment Scores by Council District

Council District	Average of 2020 PCA	Average of 2019 PCA
1	3.6	3.3
2	3.6	3.5
3	3.5	3.4
4	3.6	3.4
5	3.4	3.2
6	3.6	3.4
7	3.5	3.4
8	3.5	3.4
9	3.1	3.4
10	3.5	3.3

Fact Sheet

Integrated Pest Management

What Is Integrated Pest Management?

Pesticides are powerful tools for controlling pests. However, there are also other tools available for use in pest control, many of which pose greatly reduced risk to human health and the environment than do pesticides. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is an effective and environmentally sensitive approach that makes use of a variety of these tools. The concept—know what the problem is before you apply pesticides—is fundamental to planning a successful IPM program. IPM relies on a combination of common-sense practices and science-based strategies, rather than solely on pesticide spraying.

IPM programs use current, comprehensive information regarding the life cycles of pests—which may include insects, weeds, rodents or other small mammals or wildlife, birds, or other living organisms—and their interaction with the environment. IPM strategies make use of this information in combination with available pest control technologies to manage pests economically, and with the least possible hazard to people, property, and the environment. IPM programs take advantage of all appropriate pest management strategies, including the judicious and careful use of pesticides, when necessary.

Who Can Use IPM?

Anyone with a pest control problem can implement an IPM program—farmers, homeowners, landscape professionals, school administrators, etc. IPM principles can be applied to both agricultural settings (e.g., farms and orchards) and non-agricultural settings (e.g., homes, landscapes, schools, indoor workplaces, and wilderness areas).

IPM is not a single pest control method but, rather, an approach that involves a series of pest management evaluations, decisions, and controls. Consequently, every IPM program is different. Each program is designed around individual pest prevention goals and eradication needs, considered in the context of the environment or setting. Regardless of their differences, successful IPM programs use the same four-tiered approach.

1. Set Action Thresholds

Before taking any pest control actions, IPM users first set an action threshold—a point at which pest populations or environmental conditions indicate that pest control action must be taken. This threshold is often the level at which pests will become a health hazard or an economic threat. Finding a single pest does not always mean pest control is needed—a predetermined threshold is critical to guiding pest control decisions.

2. Monitor and Identify Pests

Not all pests require control. Many pests are not harmful, and some are even beneficial. IPM programs work to monitor for and accurately identify pests so appropriate suppression decisions can be made in conjunction with action thresholds. Information gathered from pests monitoring and identification can help users take appropriate preventative measures and reduce the possibility that pesticides will be used unnecessarily or incorrectly.

3. Prevent

Prevention—removing conditions that attract pests—is an IPM program's first line of defense. Prevention includes taking steps to ensure that pest populations cannot increase to unacceptable levels. To prevent pests from becoming a threat, IPM programs work to manage crops, landscapes, or indoor spaces—creating

an unfavorable environment for pests to colonize, grow, and reproduce.

- For an agricultural crop, prevention might include using cultural methods, such as rotating between different crops, selecting pest-resistant varieties, and planting pest-free rootstock. It also can include mechanical methods, such as cultivating weeds and regularly aerating soils.
- In a non-agricultural setting, prevention might include reducing clutter, sealing areas where pests enter the building, keeping premises free of trash and overgrown vegetation, and diverting water away from a building or field to avoid standing water.

4. Control

If monitoring, identification, and action thresholds indicate that pest control is required, and preventive methods are no longer effective or available, control methods can be employed. Control methods are evaluated on effectiveness and relative risk. Those methods found to be both most effective and pose the lowest risk are selected first. In addition to preventative measures, IPM combines two central methods for reduced-risk pest control:

- **Biologically-Based Pest Control**

These methods usually do not have toxic effects on animals or people and do not leave toxic or persistent chemical residues in the environment. These pesticides are derived from plants, animals, fungi, bacteria, some minerals, or other non-man-made synthesis. In addition, certain microorganisms—bacteria, fungi, viruses, and protozoa—can effectively control target pests. Examples of biological pesticides (also known as “biopesticides”) include:

- o Using targeted, biological pesticides (e.g., insect pheromones) to disrupt a pest’s mating cycle, and
- o Using naturally-occurring insects and competitors to help control pest populations; an example of a beneficial insect is the ladybug.

- **Chemically-Based Pest Control**

These are reduced-risk chemically-based pesticides such as herbicides, insecticides, and fungicides. They are often synthetic materials that directly kill or inactivate the pest. This pest control method is often used simultaneously with other lower-risk methods. When using chemically-based treatments, it is important to use a pesticide that only affects the targeted pest.

IPM vs. Organic

IPM takes advantage of all appropriate pest management options, including, but not limited to, the judicious use of pesticides. In contrast, organic food production applies many of the same concepts as IPM, but limits the use of pesticides to those that are produced from natural sources, as opposed to those produced from synthetic chemicals. In most cases, food grown using IPM is not identified in the marketplace as is organic food. Many individual commodity growers are working to define what IPM means for their crop and region, and IPM-labeled foods are available in some stores. With definitions, growers could begin to market more of their products as “IPM-Grown”, giving consumers another choice in their food purchases.

If further monitoring and identification indicate that reduced-risk pest controls are ineffective, then use additional controls such as the targeted spraying of a pesticide.

Where Can I Use IPM?

IPM can be used in a wide variety of situations. The following are just a few examples of situations where the use of IPM is a practical option:

- If a garden is infested by flies, use biological controls. Introduce the pest’s natural enemy, such as parasitic wasps, to reduce and control the population.
- If ants and cockroaches enter a school through a hole in rotting wood, replace the rotting wood and seal any other openings into the building.
- If the major crop on a farm is being destroyed by wilt virus, use seasonal climate to determine the best time to harvest the crop. Maintain soil and seedlings well by using netting to cover seedlings as they grow and aerating the soil between plantings.

For More Information...

EPA’s Pest Control and Pesticide Safety for Consumers

<https://www.epa.gov/safepestcontrol>

